

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figure 8.

In Figure 8, boxes 12 and 14 have been changed to read "CODING" circuit instead of "DECODING" circuit.

Attachment: Replacement sheet
 Annotated Sheet showing changes

REMARKS

Claims 1-44, 46-67 and 69-88 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-15, 17-21, 23-27, 29-33, 35-50, 52-56, 58-67, 69-73, 75-78, 80-83 and 85-88 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Drawings have been objected to. Claims 1, 34 and 57 have been objected to. Claims 1, 16, 22, 28, 34, 51, 57, 74, 79, and 84 have been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1, 22, 28, 34, 51, 57, 74, 79, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hayata (EP 0751490A2) in view of Saikaly (U.S. Patent 5,893,056) and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (Spec, pages 1-8, in the section of Background Art, hereinafter referred to as AAPA). Claim 16 has been rejected under § 103(a) over Hayata in view of Saikaly and further in view of Jarvinen et al. (U.S. Patent 5,960, 389). Claims 1, 34 and 57 have been amended hereby. Figure 8 has been amended hereby. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and below remarks.

In paragraph 7 of the Final Office Action, Figure 8 has been objected to. Specifically, in elements 12 and 14 in Figure 8, the circuits are labeled as “DECODING” circuits when in fact, they are described in the specification (at pages 3-4) as “CODING” circuits. Applicants have corrected these typographical errors in Figure 2 in the attached replacement sheet. These Amendments do not add any new matter and merely correct typographical errors and render Figure 8 consistent with the description of Figure 8 contained in the specification at pages 3-4. Withdrawal of the objection to Figure 8 is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 8 of the Final Office Action, claims 1, 34 and 57 have been objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1, 34 and 57 to address the informalities noted in the Final Office Action. These amendments do not add any new matter nor change the scope of the claims as they merely clarify idiomatic English. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 34 and 57 is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 10 of the Final Office Action, claims 1, 16, 22, 28, 34, 51, 57, 74, 79, and 84 have been rejected under the first paragraph of § 112. The Final Office Action specifically alleges that there is no support in the specification for the limitation of using “a smoothed feature parameter for spectral envelope characteristics of an immediately preceding frame.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification discloses equations (4) and (5) (see pages 18 and 21). Each of the equations (4) and (5) includes a value of $F(n-1, i)$. Here, “ $F(n, i)$ ” represents smoothed

filter coefficients while "n" represents a frame number respectively. In addition, the filter coefficients represent spectral envelope characteristics (see page 2, line 6). Accordingly, the value of $F(n-1, i)$ represents the smoothed parameter of the immediately preceding frame when $F(n, i)$ represents that of the current frame. Thus, the specification clearly supports the recitation "using a smoothed feature parameter representing spectral envelope characteristics of an immediately preceding frame."

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 16, 22, 28, 34, 51, 57, 74, 79, under the first paragraph of § 112 is therefore respectfully requested.

In paragraph 11 of the Final Office Action, claims 1, 22, 28, 34, 51, 57, 74, 79, and 84 have been rejected under § 103(a) over Hayata in view of Saikaly and further in view of Applicant's AAPA. In paragraph 12 of the Final Office Action, claim 16 has been rejected under § 103(a) over Hayata in view of Saikaly and further in view of Jarvinen. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In paragraph 6, the Final Office notes the difference in the current invention as depicted in Figure 1 and the prior art as illustrated in Figure 10 is the additional smoothing of Figure 1. The Final Office suggests that the claimed invention be clarified with respect to the smoothing feature to distinguish over the prior art. Applicant gratefully acknowledges this suggestion.

Each of independent claims 1, 34 and 57 have been amended to require:

wherein said smoothing is performed by weighting a smoothed feature parameter representing spectral envelope characteristics of an immediately preceding frame and a feature parameter representing special envelope characteristics of said current frame and by adding the weighted smoothed feature parameter representing spectral envelope characteristics of said immediately preceding frame and the weighted feature parameter representing spectral envelope characteristics of said current frame.

These features are neither taught nor suggested by the combination of the prior art. As discussed in the present specification, the AAPA does not teach the smoothing as recited in

independent claims 1, 34 and 57. Hayata merely discloses an adaptation of the strength of inverse characteristics of smoothed filter coefficient shown in Fig. 2 to the synthesis filter coefficient in each frame. The smoothed filter coefficient of the previous frame is never used for the next smoothed filter coefficient of the next frame.

On the other hand, Saikaly discloses averaging frame energy and reflection coefficients over the current frame and 18 previous frames. This is quite different from the smoothing of Hayata. And clearly different from the claimed smoothing. Furthermore, the averaging of Saikaly is executed regardless of whether the current frame includes speech or not. Accordingly, there is no reason to combine the averaging of Saikaly with smoothing of Hayata. Such a combination would not be made by one skilled in the art.

Therefore, the combination of Hayata and Saikaly does not teach or suggest the present invention. Even if AAPA is considered, Hayata and Saikaly still do not teach or suggest the present invention. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 34 and 57 as well as their dependent claims 22, 28, 51, 74, 79, and 84 is respectfully requested.

As each of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: July 12, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael J. Scheer/
Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
2049 Century Park East Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90067-3109
(310) 772-8300
Attorney for Applicant